

of them winners of masters' and doctors' degrees, in one summer commencement.

Yet we are complaining that we don't as yet have enough really trained people to cope with the complexities of the new age—not only its mechanical ones, but its social and psychological ones.

If we have anything to reproach our forefathers with—and ourselves when a few decades younger—it is that we didn't spend enough either in money or effort in the best investment any community, State, or nation can make. Now, it is well nigh the imperative investment in the new state of the world.

Whether or not Proximus has the whole solution, he does have something we should be thinking about—hard.

OUR POLLUTED GREAT LAKES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, each day brings new evidence of the major contribution that was made to the future of our Nation by the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources on which I served under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Kerr]. At my request, a hearing was held by that committee on Detroit on October 29, 1959.

At that time the voices that were being raised, in Michigan, in concern over pollution and other water problems characteristic of even the humid regions of the Midwest and East, were few and far between. Water just was not news in Michigan.

Well, we have had the report of the Senate committee and we have had the passage of 34 months. Attention is more and more being focused on the threat of pollution to commercial and sport fishermen, to would-be bathers, to industrial developers, and indeed to all who prize the quality of our water.

Today it makes good sense in Michigan that we are seeking a new commercial fisheries laboratory and a Public Health Service water pollution laboratory at Ann Arbor; that we are joining Federal, State, and local forces for a frontal attack on pollution in the Detroit River; and that we are looking to ways of preventing further fouling of the greatest inland body of water in the world—the Great Lakes.

The Detroit News, of September 3, 1962, carried an excellent editorial which fully recognizes and accurately describes our situation. Their expression of concern should have the widest attention and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INCIDENTAL DISASTER

The paradox of the Nation's water problem is that so many people, both humble and powerful, are aware of its threats to personal and national existence, yet it rouses no public fury.

Some may have thought James A. O. Crowe, the Detroit News' outdoor editor, was straining for the sensational in his story of Sunday, August 26, when he wrote that the Great Lakes could die as did the passenger pigeons and the buffalo herds. If those words are sensational, what of these from Vice President Lyndon Johnson, while he was still a Texas Senator: "As majority leader of the U.S. Senate, I am keenly aware that water management is our No. 1 economic problem."

It is a problem promising putrefaction in Detroit's front yard. In Lake Erie's 10,000 square miles of once-sparkling purity, there is sickness. While we watch, it becomes epidemic. The other Great Lakes are vulnerable to the cause of Erie's death.

It is dying because government, industry, commerce, individuals, all of us mistook freedom for license. In early days, proud Detroiters built their homes and their businesses to look toward the river and the lakes. The time now has come when beauty flees the corpse and we look the other way from our guilt.

The hard-driven businessman may snort at esthetics, at the sportsman, at Government interference. All right. The time also has come for a look at the hard facts about which business leaders prefer to talk. Here are some:

It takes 60,000 to 70,000 gallons of water to make a ton of steel, 600,000 gallons for a ton of synthetic rubber, 200,000 gallons for a ton of rayon, a thousand gallons to make a pound of high-grade paper. During the Korean war, it took 29 million gallons of water to produce just the aluminum for a single bomber.

Senator Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, is a tough businessman, many times a millionaire, an oil tycoon. He also is the ranking Democrat of the Senate Public Works Committee, an authority on water resources, author of a book on conservation. He writes:

"Conservation is the cheapest crusade in history. We must protect and improve what water we have, and we must find more water. That is the price of survival."

The plight of Lake Erie, Detroiters will say, is not a direct problem of theirs. The sickness of Lake Erie is not confined. The fight of wild life, the death and disappearance of once great shoals of fish, closed beaches, all testify to a sickness that is spreading like an epidemic into the other Great Lakes.

Its approach is felt in Chicago, in Minneapolis, Duluth, along the Canadian shore. It is spreading into Lakes St. Clair, Huron, Michigan, Lake Superior, greatest of the inland oceans, soon must be touched by forebodings.

Those living inland from the Great Lakes may say: "This is the problem of the lake-fronters." Is it? Senator Kerr emphasizes the story of Roosevelt City, within 60 miles of New York City, snug, watered by underground sources through artesian wells.

One November morning, the water taps dribbled dry, city pumps sucked sand, the schools and factories closed. Town residents drove to nearby communities to take baths and to eat. Their only water came from emergency tank trucks. Had they lived on the beaches of Lake Erie they still could not have drunk.

From border to border and coast to coast, water is America's national problem. Senator Hart, Democrat, of Michigan, who accompanied Senator Kerr to a series of 20 hearings on water resources about the Nation and joined him in sponsoring corrective legislation, described himself as "appalled."

"All of us were willing to spend millions to bring grass to the deserts of the West," he said. "While we were doing so, we were making deserts in the East where there once was a wealth of clean water."

"Of course, water is recreation—a source of food, a dwelling place for wildlife, a resource for industry. It is more. In the modern world, water means homes, no more, no less."

The Great Lakes are a resource and a problem we share with Canada. Ultimately, only joint effort by the two Governments can avert disaster. For the dedicated, there is much to be done meanwhile. Our scientists have the ability to control and end pollution. There is legislation and the statute books of Great Lakes States

which, if toughly enforced, could end most of the poisoning of our Great Lakes drinking fountains with industrial wastes and municipal sewage.

In a world looking thirstily for water, the lakes are worth more than all the gold in Fort Knox. To turn to them in emergency and find them fouled beyond use would be a greater tragedy and more irreparable loss than to open the Nation's vaults and find them but filled with trash.

The first attack on the problem of the Great Lakes is to understand the threat. The next step is to dedicate ourselves to be heard and to fight back. The Great Lakes States send a sufficiently powerful bloc of Senators and Representatives to Congress to shake that body into action—once the demand for action at home becomes a roar.

To dam the rivers to save water and fuel industry in the West is a great objective. To preserve what we already have where it is needed most should have priority.

SOVIET AID TO CUBA

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on August 31, my friend from New York [Mr. KEATING] addressed himself to the subject of Soviet aid to Cuba. Yesterday my distinguished colleague from New York appeared on a television program discussing the same subject. On the floor of the Senate on the same day he again brought up the same subject.

In his statement issued in connection with the television program, Senator KEATING called on the administration to "tell the American people the whole truth."

Mr. President, the administration has been telling the American people the whole truth. Let me address myself to the record.

On August 22 the President of the United States, in his press conference, was asked about new supplies being landed in Cuba. The President answered the question clearly and explicitly in saying that new supplies in large quantities were being landed. Let me read into the RECORD the questions and answers on the subject from his press conference.

Question. Mr. President, do you have any information or indication that Communist-bloc troops or new supplies of any kind have been landed in Cuba recently?

The PRESIDENT. Yes, new supplies definitely, in large quantities. Troops, we do not have information, but an increased number of technicians.

Question. What is the significance of this, in your opinion?

The PRESIDENT. Well, we are examining it now.

Question. Do you think it is aimed at any other Central American country?

The PRESIDENT. No, there is no evidence of that. And we are not talking about—as far as the numbers, we are not talking about the kind of entrants in numbers which would provide support for the sort of operations you suggested. What we are talking about are supplies and technicians of rather intensive quantity in recent weeks.

Question. Mr. President, you spoke of the increased supplies going to Cuba. What countries are they going there from?

The PRESIDENT. The bloc.

Of course, that refers, in that instance, to the Soviet bloc.

On August 24 the Department of State gave a background press and radio news briefing on this subject. The background press conference is a well estab-

lished procedure employed in Washington, over many, many years by many administrations to get additional facts on foreign policy questions out to the American people through the press.

I submit for the Record an article from the Washington Post, an article from the New York Times, and other articles—most of them dated August 25. There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Aug. 24, 1962]
UNITED STATES DOUBTS AID TO CUBA IS MILITARY

(By Peter Lisagor)

WASHINGTON, August 24.—The many Communist-bloc supplies and technicians reaching Cuba in recent weeks are believed here to be directed at propping up Premier Castro's wobbly economy rather than building up an arsenal.

Informed officials admit to a paucity of hard evidence as to the contents of some 30 ships known to have arrived at Cuban ports in the last month.

They also say that the rumor mills in refugee-cluttered Miami and the Caribbean appear to have exaggerated the size and purpose of the admittedly unusual number of shipments from Communist countries.

A State Department spokesman said today: "We have seen nothing of any military offensive significance. The ships coming in during the last few weeks must be seen in the larger context of the Soviets' trying to keep Castro afloat."

[He confirmed that 15 Communist ships—some apparently carrying military equipment—were due to dock in Cuba this weekend.]

FOUR THOUSAND MIGRANTS

The estimates here are that the ships have brought in 4,000 to 5,000 personnel, some of them Cubans returning from training schools, some Communist-bloc technicians.

They also have brought in quantities of trucks, tractors, and crates that could contain small arms or other military equipment.

Officials say the situation will be carefully watched to see if the supplies continue to come into Cuba at the same high rate.

But at the moment, they add, there are no indications of anything like a massive buildup of combat materiel.

The Cuban economy is pictured here as being in such dismal shape as to give communism a bad name even among Marxists. The Castro regime has had to suspend some of its top industrial managers in the last few days for their failures.

SUGAR INDUSTRY HARD HIT

The sugar industry, the backbone of the Castro economy, is described by diplomatic sources here as in critical condition. Worker absenteeism has contributed to the island's economic deterioration.

For these reasons, the belief here is that the shipments are more likely to be of economic significance rather than military, although more guns and military hardware may be considered essential for several purposes.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 25, 1962]

RUSSIANS SEE UP FLOW OF ARMS AM. TO

CASTRO REGIME

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

WASHINGTON, August 24.—U.S. officials said today that Soviet equipment and technical personnel, military and civilian, were pouring into Cuba.

At least 20 cargo ships and an unspecified number of passenger ships have arrived at Cuban ports since large-scale deliveries were resumed late in July after a lull, it was said.

The equipment may include ground-to-air missiles, largely defense weapons. There apparently is transportation, electrical and construction equipment, such as communications vans, radar vans and mobile generator units. These appear to be going into coastal and air defenses.

TOTAL PUT AT 3,000 TO 5,000

Technicians, probably half of them military, are estimated at 3,000 to 5,000. These include several hundred who arrived earlier in the year.

Intelligence reports do not indicate the arrival of troops or equipment that would add significantly to the limited offensive power of the Cuban forces.

These forces, according to officials here, are incapable of getting off the island. The only on-island targets are the U.S. naval installation at Guantanamo Bay and anti-Castro guerrillas, the existence of which the regime of Premier Fidel Castro has acknowledged.

The new equipment would also tend to discourage Cuban rebels in any plans or hopes for mounting another invasion.

HEMISPHERE ALERTED

A Government official said the deliveries were a matter of concern to the entire Western Hemisphere.

Moscow's broadcast explanation has been that its ships are carrying machine tools, wheat, agricultural machinery, tinne goods, combine harvesters, fertilizers, and cereals.

However, 40-foot crates indicate to observers that the contents are equipment not used in agriculture or on household tables. Trucks drive onto the ships and then leave with tarpaulins covering their cargoes. Some ships are unloaded under strict security conditions. Several ports beside Havana are being used.

There is no evidence that troops from the Soviet bloc or nuclear warheads have arrived in Cuba.

Earlier this week, exiled Cuban leaders in the United States reported that more than 5,000 soldiers from Soviet bloc countries had been landed in Cuba during the last 2 weeks by Soviet ships. Similar reports circulated earlier.

U.S. officials have reported in each instance that they knew of no military forces being landed in Cuba. The reports have been ridiculed by the Communist press in Havana.

One official's view is that the Soviet Union, fully approving of the Castro brand of communism, agreed to a deeper involvement in Cuban affairs. Propped up by a major power, the Castro regime is in a better position to stiffen the backs of its supporters and frighten its enemies.

Although the shipments are large enough to cause concern, they are far smaller than the volume that the Soviet Union has sent, for example, to Indonesia.

Some of the foreign technicians in Cuba are clearly economic and agricultural. The military technicians are apparently there to train Cubans in the maintenance and use of the equipment. There is no solid information that any of these military personnel are in combat units.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 25, 1962]

UNITED STATES EYES RISING RED AID TO CUBA

(By Donald May)

Russia is pouring from 3,000 to 5,000 men and military technicians into Cuba and providing the Castro regime with modern equipment, possibly including surface-to-air missiles, U.S. officials reported yesterday.

Shipments of technicians and equipment have been going on for several weeks and more cargoes are en route, the officials said.

The Kennedy administration was said to be watching the situation closely and with some concern.

BUILDUP COMES QUICKLY

According to the officials, the buildup has come about rather quickly. It started in late July and apparently means the Soviet Union decided some months ago to give more support to the Fidel Castro regime as at least a semimember of the Soviet bloc.

In addition to the military supplies there has been material for civilian use. But officials said some electronic gear has been sighted that conceivably could be turned into a system that could monitor U.S. missile launchings from Cape Canaveral on the Florida coast.

U.S. experts believe the total military buildup will not increase significantly the quite limited offensive capabilities of the Cuban Army. Instead, the equipment appears to be designed to improve the country's coastal and air defenses. The technicians appear to be there to teach Cubans how to use it.

LINKED TO MOSCOW TRIP

Raul Castro, Cuba's Armed Forces Minister, made a mysterious visit to Moscow last month and some Cuban observers feel he sought and obtained the supplies.

Of the Soviet technicians, at least half are believed to be military specialists assigned to help set up the new equipment and train Cubans to use it.

Despite frequent reports from Cuban exile groups about "Soviet troop" landings in Cuba, officials here said none of the arrivals was seen to wear uniforms. They also said there was no solid information that any of the recent arrivals were organized in combat military units.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 25, 1962]

UNITED STATES REPORTS ON RUSSIA'S ISLAND BASE

WASHINGTON.—The Russians are pouring men and military hardware—including possible surface-to-air missiles—through a long pipeline to Fidel Castro in Cuba.

Halfway across the world, from Soviet ports to the Caribbean, hard by the tip of the southeastern United States, the extent of recent Soviet shipments is beginning to worry administration specialists here.

The big Soviet buildup, U.S. officials reported yesterday, began about a month ago. Today there are between 3,000 and 5,000 Soviet technicians of all levels of military organization installed by the regime of Premier Castro.

Presence of specialists and assorted weapons is a hand-in-hand operation for Castro and the Russians that can function this way:

They can strengthen the Castro Cuban coastal and air defenses.

They present a readymade Soviet base from which further operations—or simply the potential threat of expanding adventures—can be held as a club over the United States.

The Russians for years have demanded that we dismantle NATO bases near their frontiers. They can be expected to use their Cuban buildup as a quid pro quo: They'll quit, if we also withdraw elsewhere.

Reefing up Castro's gunsmoke strength with knowledgeable specialists and equipment also has the intent of discouraging mounting anti-Castro sabotage inside the country. In effect, his big brothers have come to Castro's aid with physical power within sight of the "Tanqis."

For some time there had been an inclination here to soft-pedal the Soviet buildup in Cuba. Obviously there is a clash of opinion among people who are supposed to assess and estimate those power problems. It's a question of how much or little alarm exists.

For example, in addition to the Monroe Doctrine, there have been resolutions since 1959 by the Organization of the American

States, condemning just what the Russians have been doing. Still, the U.S.S.R. has continued to dispatch, unchecked, forces and arms into the Americas.

WORRIERS WIN

Some U.S. experts believe there's plenty to be alarmed about and that the public-at-large should be made aware of this. Their critics, also experts, claim that it isn't as rough as it may seem on the surface.

The worriers appear, at least as of yesterday, to have come out on top so that a picture of the Soviet buildup in Cuba was analyzed.

Their presentation came after an attorney, who got world notice for his work in the release of U-2 Pilot Francis Gary Powers, got the official OK to go to Cuba.

James B. Donovan, New York lawyer, has his passport validated to go to Cuba. There, he will try to negotiate an exchange of prisoners seized by Castro after the 1961 fiasco of the Bay of Pigs invasion. Castro wants them ransomed for nearly \$60 million.

Mr. Donovan said he was assured by Castro's regime that he would be welcome. He also met Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy Thursday. About that meeting, Mr. Donovan kept mum.

STEP UP PATROLS

But the worrisome phase of Soviet meddling in the Caribbean makes Mr. Donovan's mission something of a sidelight even with the assumption that he'll be talking to the top people in the Castro regime.

Since the Russians intensified their activity in the Caribbean, it's a safe enough guess that the United States will step up patrols. This probably means more Navy sea and air patrols out of Guantanamo Bay.

Surveillance from that base has been a regular duty. Possibly added to its expansion will be longer range observation by the Navy and Air Force. That could possibly lead to incidents.

Castro has complained regularly at what he called violation of Cuban airspace by low-flying U.S. aircraft. Now that he has the potential to use ground-to-air missiles, thought to be like the U.S. Nike, it's conceivable a U.S. plane could be brought down.

The decision to divulge details of the Soviet buildup which coincides with Russian pressure on Berlin, resumption of Soviet nuclear weapons tests and the astro-twins space feats, must have been made in the last 48 hours.

At his press conference Wednesday, President Kennedy made a terse reference to Cuba but he supplied no details. The nature of the supplies, covering trucks to radar vans and electronic equipment carried in 15 to 20 Soviet vessels, was disclosed yesterday.

PROTEST MARCH IN TIMES SQUARE

Fifty demonstrators paraded around the Armed Forces recruiting office booth in Times Square last night to protest the reported landing of Russian troops and supplies in Cuba, expected to begin today.

The demonstration was sponsored by the Cuban Rescue Committee, of 468 Eighth Avenue. It included mostly Cubans and persons of Cuban descent, with a scattering of American students and a few children. Twenty patrolmen and four sergeants were assigned to the demonstration, which was orderly.

From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 28, 1962: "The Soviet Union is sending a massive spurt in Soviet deliveries to Cuba. It is that from the Soviet point of view this is a decision to prop up the Castro regime, which is now confronted with economic troubles and popular discontent. The Soviet Union is now more deeply involved in the Castro regime and committed to maintain it. While Castro is having troubles of many kinds, it is not believed that his regime is in danger of imminent collapse. For such large amounts of personnel and equipment to reach Cuba at this time, the decision to ship had to have been made 5 or 6 months ago. Coming in February, the Soviet and Cuban radio and press accused the United States of preparing aggression against Cuba. Apparently these claims were taken seriously by the United States. Coast and air defense military equipment would be the natural answer to such fears, since Castro is already well supplied with tanks and other ground military material."

At least eight ships delivered military cargo between July 26 and August 8. There have been additional deliveries since then. Cargoes delivered and cargoes in ships now on the way from Soviet ports are believed to total about 20, an estimate that may be about 2 ships off, either plus or minus.

MANY TECHNICIANS SENT

At the same time, large numbers of Soviet technicians have also arrived in five or more passenger ships. There is no indication that the current rush of Soviet personnel and equipment to Cuba has ended.

It is estimated now that there are from 3,000 to 5,000 Soviet technicians in Cuba, with more to come. Until the recent massive increase, they were numbered in hundreds. From one-half to two-thirds are believed to be military technicians, trainers, and advisers.

These statements are intelligence estimates made by responsible officials. It is emphasized that not all this intelligence is positive or "hard." The data were released, apparently, because of exaggerated reports that have been published, commonly based on information from Cuban refugees with island connections.

NO FOREIGN TROOPS

Some have claimed that there are 18,000 Russian and 5,000 Chinese troops in Cuba. According to U.S. intelligence there are no Russian or Chinese in Cuba in uniform or in standard military-type organizations.

The recent military deliveries include large quantities of transportation, electronic, and communications equipment. This includes such items as communications vans, radar vans, and generating units on large tractor-trailers.

Crates 40 feet long were unloaded at some ports and hauled away on trailers under maximum security conditions. It is believed that much of the equipment was for coast defense and air defense purposes. It is believed officially that missiles similar to the U.S. Nike air defense missiles were an important part of the shipments.

MISSILE EQUIPMENT

This estimate is qualified by the fact that the crates were not unloaded where the equipment could be observed. However, radar and other equipment observed was obviously part of air defense missile unit equipment.

It is stated officially that the new equipment does not add significantly to the small Cuban defensive potentiality. It is also stated that the large additional number of technicians is compatible with the requirement for setting up and training Cuban personnel in the operation of the equipment.

This position is questioned in military circles.

The official explanation of the sudden and massive spurt in Soviet deliveries to Cuba is that from the Soviet point of view this is a decision to prop up the Castro regime, which is now confronted with economic troubles and popular discontent.

The Soviet Union is now more deeply involved in the Castro regime and committed to maintain it. While Castro is having troubles of many kinds, it is not believed that his regime is in danger of imminent collapse.

For such large amounts of personnel and equipment to reach Cuba at this time, the decision to ship had to have been made 5 or 6 months ago. Coming in February, the Soviet and Cuban radio and press accused the United States of preparing aggression against Cuba. Apparently these claims were taken seriously by the United States. Coast and air defense military equipment would be the natural answer to such fears, since Castro is already well supplied with tanks and other ground military material.

IMPACT ON NAVAL BASE

If air defense missiles were deployed around the U.S. Guantanamo Bay Naval Base in Cuba, there could be serious results. Although the two landing strips there are approached from the sea, it is often necessary for planes to circle. The small extent of the Guantanamo base makes it difficult for high-speed jet aircraft to keep within its boundaries.

The Cubans have been subjected to a large amount of propaganda about U.S. violations of its airspace. If a trigger-happy Cuban crew with its Russian advisers shot down an American military plane that accidentally strayed over Cuban territory, a serious international incident would be created.

The Russian technicians operate in high-security areas. Only specially qualified Cubans are allowed in these areas.

The Moscow Radio, broadcasting in Spanish to Cuba, explains that the shipments arriving are thousands of tons of tinned goods, lumber, fertilizer and harvesting machinery.

It is rumored that the United States is seriously considering an air and sea blockade of Cuba.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it will be noticed that all these stories contain the same set of facts. All of them mention 3,000 to 5,000 Soviet technicians. All of them mention the possibility of ground-to-air missiles. All of them mention the strengthening of coastal and air defenses. It will be noticed also, Mr. President, that all these articles relate that the information came from U.S. officials. What we have here, quite clearly, is evidence that the administration held a background press conference to get these facts out to the American people.

These articles were published after the original statement made by the President of the United States in his press conference on August 22.

On Wednesday, August 29, the State Department also briefed a bipartisan group in the House of Representatives—in fact, invited all House Members who so desired to attend. I ask unanimous consent to make a part of the Record the statement supplied to the House of Representatives at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Hawaii in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SOVIET MILITARY AID TO CUBA

After a lull since early 1962 the Soviet Union resumed large-scale military deliveries to Cuba in the last week in July. Since then, Soviet ship movements to Cuba have totaled at least 25, including at least 5 passenger ships. This is in addition to normal tanker and cargo movements. The shipments contained both military and economic goods and personnel. Although full details are not yet available on the contents of the ships, nor of the breakdown between military and nonmilitary, information to date indicates the following:

Cargo: Military cargo, perhaps as much as half of the total, included large quantities of transportation, electronic, and construction equipment, such as communications vans, radar vans, trucks, and mobile generator units. Much of the equipment is likely to go into the improvement of coastal and air defenses. The size and shape of some of the boxes delivered suggests that it is possible they could contain ground-to-air missiles for antiaircraft use, but we have no information on that as yet. These missiles are not adaptable for nuclear use.

Nonmilitary cargo, roughly half of the total, consists of deliveries already behind schedule of industrial and agricultural equipment under aid and trade agreements.

Personnel: A large number of additional Soviet specialists arrived in Cuba in the same period. With the recent arrivals, the total number in Cuba or on the way, both military and nonmilitary, may be as high as 5,000. The breakdown between military and technical personnel is not known, but the additional numbers of military specialists are not incompatible with the training and setting up of the complex military equipment which has arrived. There is no evidence of the arrival of Soviet combat troops from other Soviet bloc countries.

The shipments consist of both economic goods and defensive military goods. They appear designed to enhance the Cuban regime's defense capabilities against an internal threat, and to increase the effectiveness of the Cuban military establishment for possible internal use. Information to date indicates that the shipments will not improve significantly the very limited offensive capabilities of the Cuban armed forces.

The recent shipments indicate a significant increase in Soviet involvement in Cuba. The increased amount of military assistance accompanies stepped-up Soviet economic aid to try to relieve Cuban shortages. The shipments must have been planned several months ago to have arrived when they did. The Cuban regime, facing economic deterioration and rising popular discontent, probably hopes to strengthen its internal position through new demonstrations of Soviet support.

RECENT STATEMENT BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE CONCERNING U.S. POLICY TOWARD CUBA

U.S. policy is to bring all the pressure we can to isolate Cuba and to prevent Cuba from being able to have an impact on the rest of Latin America. The United States, in cooperation with friendly member states of the Organization of American States and other international bodies, will take all feasible measures to give the Cuban people a chance to choose freely the government they want. We believe that the Cuban people would not choose Castro communism.

We remain concerned over the threat which the Cuban regime poses for the peace and security of the hemisphere. Through effective collective action we will defeat the Cuban regime in its announced objective of creating Communist revolutionary regimes in other Latin American countries. The Foreign Ministers of the American Republics, at their meeting in January 1962, found the Cuban regime incompatible with the inter-American system, excluded the Cuban regime from participation in that system, and recommended a series of measures to assist OAS member states individually and collectively to combat Communist subversion.

RECENT STATEMENT BY EDWIN M. MARTIN, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR LATIN AMERICAN AFFAIRS, AS REPORTED BY THE U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, AUGUST 6, 1962

Question. Is the fixed goal, then, to get rid of Castro?

Answer. We want to get rid of Castro and the Soviet Communist influence in Cuba—not just Castro. I think the Soviet Communist influence is more serious than Castro, although Castro should be added in. But we also are, meanwhile, very anxious to prevent him from having any impact elsewhere.

Question. Is Castro really just a Communist stooge?

Answer. No; I don't think so. I think it is very difficult always for an outsider to understand the real power relationship within a political organization. It's hard in this country, sometimes, to know who is pulling strings.

But, insofar as we know the situation from outside, I think we would have to say that right now Castro is the boss. Now, this doesn't mean he has a completely free hand or that he doesn't take advice, but there was some feeling 6 months ago that he was falling into the background and being taken over by the old-line Communist crowd. Although this may have been the case then, it certainly is not the case now. Castro is making the statements of policy.

Question. How long do you think he can hold the situation together down there?

Answer. It's very hard to say.

Question. Do you think 20 years, 50 years, or 2 years?

Answer. Well, it would be closer to 2 years than the other two figures. Maybe this is wishful thinking, but this would seem to me true.

I think there is, undoubtedly, some tension between the old-line Communists and Castro and his crowd. I think it's in part the kind of tension that is normally generated by a bad situation. Basically, though, it's a competition for power, accompanied by some personal frictions.

As of the moment, though, I think that the old-line Communists realize that their popular appeal would not permit them to maintain control very long without Castro—he is popular with the countryside. Nor would they wish to lose Castro as their principal source of appeal in the rest of Latin America.

Question. Might the whole situation just collapse, economically?

Answer. It's not impossible, but hardly something we can count on to solve our problem at any early date. With the economic situation worsening as it is doing—and, if you believe only what Castro says, it's quite bad—this undoubtedly puts a great deal of pressure on the Government. When you think of the problems even relatively well-organized, well-disciplined societies have had with an extensive rationing system, you can imagine, with the degree of shortage they have, what a shambale it must be there.

Question. Is Russia supplying much to Cuba?

Answer. They are supplying a substantial amount of things, but not nearly enough really to meet the gap and prevent the difficulties they are now having. And, of course, increasingly, at least for another year, Russia will have to be supplying on credit because the poor sugar harvest has meant that they've had to cut back their commitments for delivery of sugar.

Question. Do you think Castro can be pushed out of Cuba without military invasion from the outside?

Answer. Yes; I think that's possible.

If you look around Latin America, people apparently with a lot stronger positions than he has have collapsed and been thrown out without outside intervention. But, again, I don't want to suggest we can relax.

Question. Do you think some other "Castros" may develop elsewhere in Latin America?

Answer. At the moment, I'm reasonably optimistic on this point, although one certainly can't rule out the possibility completely. Castro's image, I think, has considerably diminished in attractiveness over the past 6 to 9 months—partly because his confession that he has always been a Marxist-Leninist has disabused those who thought he was a Latin American reformer and somebody they could copy—that was in their image—and, secondly, because of the economic conditions within Cuba.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on August 30, a letter was sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It contained substantially the same information. This letter was sent for the use

of all members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

In addition, on August 30 in his press conference President Kennedy was again asked about the Cuban situation. He was specifically asked about a statement made by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], calling for a U.S. invasion of Cuba to stop the flow of troops and supplies. I wish to read into the Record the questions and answers on that matter from the President's August 30 news conference:

Question. Mr. President, Senator [HOMER E.] CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, in a speech the other day said that the Communists are sending troops into Cuba, not technicians, as you told us last week.

The reference, of course, is to the press conference of August 22.

CAPEHART, according to the United Press International, also called for a U.S. invasion of Cuba to stop the flow of troops and supplies. Would you comment, sir?

Answer. We have no evidence of troops. And I must say that I know that this matter is of great concern to Americans and many others. The United States has obligations all around the world, including West Berlin and other areas, which are very sensitive, and, therefore, I think that in considering what appropriate action we should take, we have to consider the totality of our obligations, and also the responsibilities which we bear in so many different parts of the world. In response to your specific question, we do not have information that troops have come into Cuba, No. 1. No. 2, the main thrust, of course, is assistance because of the mismanagement of the Cuban economy which brought widespread dissatisfaction, economic slowdown, agricultural failures, which have been so typical of the Communist regimes in so many parts of the world. So that I think the situation was critical enough that they needed to be bolstered up.

However, we are continuing to watch what happens in Cuba with the closest attention and will respond to—will be glad to announce any new information, if it should come, immediately.

By the way, that promise has been kept.

Question. Mr. President, did you answer my question, on CAPEHART's suggestion that we invade Cuba? Was that your answer?

Answer. I am not for invading Cuba at this time. No, I don't—the words do not have some secondary meaning. I think it would be a mistake to invade Cuba.

Question. Mr. President, the Soviets, as you well know—

Answer. Because I think it would lead—that it should be—an action like that, which could be very casually suggested, can lead to very serious consequences for many people.

Question. Mr. President, I wonder if a distinction could be made with respect to the troops in Cuba. Some of us were told at the State Department the other day—

This referred to the background briefing—

that there is Russian military personnel in Cuba, that these are military technicians, and they are people who are probably going to operate missiles, similar to the Nike missiles.

Is this in accord—

Answer. I don't know who told you that at the State Department, that they are going to operate Nike missiles, because that information we do not have at this time.

There certainly are technicians there, and they may be military technicians. We don't

have complete information about what's going on in Cuba, but since the word "troops" has been generally used, they had a military advisory commission there for a long period of time, so there may be additional military advisory personnel or technicians. But on the question of troops, as it is generally understood, we do not have evidence that there are Russian troops there. There is an expanded advisory and technical mission. That is correct.

Question. Are there no antiaircraft missiles shipped into Cuba?

Answer. We have no information as yet.

Question. Mr. President—

Answer. That does not mean that there have not been, but all I am saying is that we have no such information as yet.

The statement made by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] with reference to this matter appears on page 18359 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 31. In addition, as I have previously said, Senator KEATING on September 4 made a further reference to the Cuban situation. His remarks appear on pages 18438-18440 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 4.

The Senator from New York was in error on his information. On August 31 he made the statement:

The convoy moved on military order and contained the first amphibious vehicles observed in Cuba.

Our intelligence, as indicated by the President in his statement of September 4, makes it very clear that we have no information with respect to amphibious vehicles. The President said:

There is no evidence—

First—

of any organized combat force in Cuba from any Soviet bloc country;

Second—

of military bases provided by Russia;

Third—

of a violation of the 1934 treaty relating to Guantanamo;

Fourth—

of the presence of offensive ground-to-ground missiles;

Fifth—

of other significant offensive capability either in Cuban hands or under Soviet direction and guidance.

The President went on to say:

Were it otherwise, the gravest issues would arise.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this point the full transcript of the news conference at the White House yesterday afternoon, September 4, 1962, in which the President's position is fully set forth; and I ask unanimous consent that the full transcript of the conference be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS CONFERENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE WITH PIERRE SALINGER, SEPTEMBER 4, 1962

Mr. SALINGER. I am going to read a statement, which is a statement of the President. All Americans, as well as all of our friends in this hemisphere, have been concerned over the recent moves of the Soviet Union to bolster the military power of the Castro

regime in Cuba. Information has reached this Government in the last 4 days.

Question. Are you giving us paragraphs?

Mr. SALINGER. I will.

Question. Is there a "that"?

Mr. SALINGER (reading). "Information has reached this Government in the last 4 days from a variety of sources which establishes without doubt that the Soviets have provided the Cuban Government with a number of antiaircraft defense missiles with a slant range of 25 miles which are similar to early models of our Nike. Along with these missiles, the Soviets are apparently providing the extensive radar and other electronic equipment which is required for their operation. We can also confirm the presence of several Soviet-made motor torpedo boats carrying ship-to-ship guided missiles having a range of 15 miles. The number of Soviet military technicians now known to be in Cuba or en route—approximately 3,500—is consistent with assistance in setting up and learning to use this equipment. As I stated last week, we shall continue to make information available as fast as it is obtained and properly verified.

"There is no evidence of any organized combat force in Cuba from any Soviet bloc country; of military bases provided to Russia."

Question. Don't you mean "by"?

Question. They are not making any available.

Question. They are not giving any bases to Russia.

Mr. SALINGER (reading). "To Russia; of a violation of the 1934 treaty relating to Guantanamo; of the presence of offensive ground-to-ground missiles; or of other significant offensive capability either in Cuban hands or under Soviet direction and guidance. Were it to be otherwise, the gravest issues would arise.

"The Cuban question must be considered as a part of the worldwide challenge posed by Communist threats to the peace. It must be dealt with as a part of that larger issue as well as in the context of the special relationships which have long characterized the Inter-American system.

"It continues to be the policy of the United States that the Castro regime will not be allowed to export its aggressive purposes by force or the threat of force. It will be prevented by whatever means may be necessary from taking action against any part of the Western Hemisphere. The United States, in conjunction with other hemisphere countries, will make sure that while increased Cuban armaments will be a heavy burden to the unhappy people of Cuba themselves, they will be nothing more."

Question. Pierre, was this statement discussed this afternoon with the leaders of both parties?

Mr. SALINGER. The situation, the current situation, in Cuba, as well as the information contained in the statement, was discussed by the President with the Secretary of State and other key officials of the administration, with a bipartisan group of leaders from both Houses of Congress here at the White House immediately prior to the release of this statement.

Question. Who were the Members?

Mr. SALINGER. I will read the names of those who were present.

Senators: MANFORD, FULBRIGHT, RUSSELL, SPARKMAN, DIRKSEN, KUCHEL, BYRNE, LOOPER, and WILEY.

Representatives: The Speaker, the majority leader, VINEY, SIKES, HALLOCK, ARDEN, and CHURCHILL.

Question. Was anybody else from the Cabinet besides the Secretary of State there?

Mr. SALINGER. Secretary McNamara was present; that is correct.

Question. How long did this meeting last?

Mr. SALINGER. About 1 hour.

Question. Did the President ask what they thought of this statement or did he read it to them?

Mr. SALINGER. No, the statement was not read to them. The information which it contained was given to them.

Question. Is it correct to infer that the entire tenor of the statement is to make it clear that the Cuban buildup at the moment, so far, is defensive or defensive weapons?

Mr. SALINGER. I think the statement speaks for itself, Ralph.

Question. Is the implication of the statement, Pierre, that so long as it remains defensive, you are not going to do anything about it?

Mr. SALINGER. The statement speaks for itself. I do not intend to go beyond the statement.

Question. What is "slant range"?

Mr. SALINGER. For background:

It means it can't go straight up 25 miles. Question. It means horizontal distance?

Mr. SALINGER. That is right.

Question. None of the Soviet land-based missiles of which this Government is aware could be used to hit the mainland of the United States?

Mr. SALINGER. Again, I think we have described what the missiles were that we currently have information on.

Question. Is that the end?

Mr. SALINGER. That is the end.

Question. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ENGLE. In order that there may be no doubt as to a full discussion of this matter, I also wish to place in the RECORD the transcript of the press conference of September 3, 1962, in which Mr. Salinger was asked various questions with reference to this matter; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the full transcript of the discussion at that time.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS CONFERENCE AT THE WHITE HOUSE WITH PIERRE SALINGER, SEPTEMBER 3, 1962

Mr. SALINGER. I have nothing.

Question. Do you have any comment on the Russian charge that a U-2 overflew the Soviet territory?

Mr. SALINGER. No, I have no comment. I think, however, that the State Department will have something to say about it in the very near future.

Question. When?

Mr. SALINGER. In the very near future.

Question. What about Senator KEATING's comment about the Russia-Cuba buildup? It was announced that the White House would announce the inaccuracies later in day.

Mr. SALINGER. If we can deal with the U-2, then I will get on that.

Question. What do you mean by "the near future"?

Mr. SALINGER. The next several hours.

Question. Has the President been in consultation with the State Department on it?

Mr. SALINGER. The President is apprised of the situation.

Question. When was he informed, Pierre, and how?

Mr. SALINGER. This morning. He was apprised this morning.

Question. Before he landed back here?

Mr. SALINGER. No, I think when he landed he was told of the Soviet note.

Question. Pierre, can you tell us whether the spokesman in London, in the Air Force, who made the statement this morning, has been instructed to say more or say nothing from now on?

Mr. SALINGER. I am going to say absolutely nothing on this subject.

Question. Not you? I am asking about the spokesman in London.

Mr. SALINGER. I am not going to say anything about any other spokesman. In other words, I am not commenting on the situation.

Question. Pierre, when the State Department puts out its answer—

Mr. SALINGER. I didn't say they were going to put out their answer. I said they would have something to say about it.

Question. Will this be in the form of a written statement or will there be someone who can be questioned?

Mr. SALINGER. I am sure there will be nobody present who can be questioned.

Question. Pierre, are we going to understand that the State Department is going to handle this inquiry?

Mr. SALINGER. That is correct.

Question. Did your conference this morning with Mr. Manning and Mr. Sylvester have to do with the U-2 incident?

Mr. SALINGER. It did not.

Question. Pierre, has the note been relayed here yet?

Mr. SALINGER. I will refer you to the State Department on that.

Question. Is the State Department in consultation with other agencies so the answer will be coordinated?

Mr. SALINGER. The State Department will handle this matter.

Question. The State Department, whatever their reaction or whatever they do publicly in this, they are serving as the spokesman for the Government in this whole matter?

Mr. SALINGER. The State Department will make any statement they care to make.

Question. Pierre, will you explain to us why, on an incident of this kind, the White House has nothing to say, yet last week when a plane was allegedly shot at by a Cuban patrol boat, and the plane was flown by a Reserve pilot, and we only have his word that this happened, the White House saw fit to make a statement? What is the difference between these two incidents?

Mr. SALINGER. The State Department will handle this matter.

Question. Pierre, can you tell us what the status of the U-2's are right now? Are they flying for NASA or the Air Force?

Mr. SALINGER. Any statement on this matter will be made by the State Department.

Question. Aside from this matter—

Mr. SALINGER. I don't intend to say anything about it, Bob; not one single word.

Question. Is the President going to have a press conference this week?

Mr. SALINGER. I don't know yet. I will let you know this afternoon.

Question. Pierre, who apprised the President of this?

Mr. SALINGER. I believe Mr. Bundy did.

Question. Can you tell us what the Pentagon press officials were in here for?

Mr. SALINGER. No.

Question. Pierre, in another field, what is the White House role, if any, in the action of the Armed Forces radio broadcast in Iran? Have you called for any report on that? Have you received any reports on it?

Mr. SALINGER. We have received a report on it and our information is that the hoax was perpetrated on the Armed Forces radio in Teheran and we are looking into the matter.

Question. What was the hoax, Pierre?

Mr. SALINGER. I refer you to the story that emanated from there.

Question. You say the hoax was perpetrated on the Armed Forces radio?

Mr. SALINGER. Yes.

Question. Now, about Senator Keating and the Cuban situation—

Mr. SALINGER. I am going to discuss this subject for background only.

Question. What is this?

Mr. SALINGER. This is Senator Keating on Cuba.

First, I notice in the UP report that Senator Keating said a White House spokesman had called the studio and stated that the President or the White House would reply to Senator Keating's inaccuracies upon his return. That is inaccurate.

I called Mr. Chancellor and took exception with a statement he made at the opening of his broadcast in which he said that the President had stated that there were no Soviet military personnel in Cuba. The President did not state that.

A reading of his press conference remarks of last Wednesday will show what he did say on that subject.

As far as Mr. Keating's remarks about the numbers of technicians or ships, I see nothing in that matter which has not been made public by the Government before.

Question. Do you mean the figures he has are figures that have been made public by the Government?

Mr. SALINGER. I couldn't tell you—there may be variations of hundreds or so, but the general information that he made public has been made public by the Government before on the subject of troops and so on.

Question. In general, it is correct, the information?

Mr. SALINGER. But what I am trying to point out is that there is nothing new or different about his statements on troops or ships.

Question. Then we have a question, don't we, of timing; which came first? Are we saying now that there are 5,000 Soviet troops which have landed in Cuba?

Mr. SALINGER. I am not saying that at all. I don't think he said that.

Question. Keating said there were 1,200 Soviet troops.

Mr. SALINGER. He has two different figures. Again, I want to remind you that everything on this Cuban thing is on background.

A reading of Senator Keating's statements on technicians and ships reveals nothing that has not been revealed before.

Question. Are you confirming that there are Soviet troops in Cuba? Twelve hundred?

Mr. SALINGER. I refer you to the President's statement last Wednesday. He made very clear what our information was at that time, and he also stated at that time if we had any other verified information on this subject we would make it public. That is our policy.

Question. There has been no change since last Wednesday; is that the idea?

Mr. SALINGER. When and if we receive any further verified information dealing with movements of technicians, troops, or any other subject involving Soviet military aid to Cuba, we will make it public, as the President indicated.

Question. Aren't we in a peculiar situation here where you are discussing, as a press secretary, a remark by the President, and we can't—

Mr. SALINGER. You can certainly quote the President's remarks at the press conference.

Question. But we are on background when you are discussing something the President said in the press conference.

Mr. SALINGER. Certainly, what the President said in the press conference is on the record.

Question. Smitty raised a vital point. The whole device of background, as we understand it, is to protect officials when they are dealing with delicate foreign policy matters.

Mr. SALINGER. You don't think this is a delicate foreign policy matter?

Question. No. You are dealing with the Hill. It is a political matter.

Mr. SALINGER. Maybe Senator Keating would like it to be.

Question. You have confirmed what he said, but you won't confirm it on the record.

Mr. SALINGER. I am going to stand by what I said and by the rules under which I said it.

Question. What kind of background is this—White House officials, Government spokesmen, or what?

Mr. SALINGER. You can say White House officials.

Question. Pierre, hasn't the State Department, perhaps for background if not officially, put out various figures about the number of ships and personnel and so forth?

Mr. SALINGER. That is correct, and I believe—although I considered this a violation of the rule at the time—I believe that Mr. Wilson's question at the President's press conference last Wednesday was an indication of where some of this information came from.

Question. Pierre, the President, in his press conference, said that as far as we can say now, in the term as it is generally used, we do not know of any Russian troops in Cuba.

Mr. SALINGER. As the word "troops" is generally understood; that is correct.

Question. Are we standing by that today?

Mr. SALINGER. We are standing by that today.

Question. Despite what Keating said this morning?

Mr. SALINGER. I believe we are having a semantical discussion.

Question. How do you define "troops?"

Question. You have used the words "technicians" and "ships." You have not used the word "troops."

Mr. SALINGER. I am using the words that the President used in his press conference.

Question. Keating said the word "troops" there, in the commonly accepted term of "troops."

Mr. SALINGER. I agree with what you said.

Question. I agree this is getting into a semantical big, but you said Keating did not disclose anything which had not been revealed before, and yet he used "troops" and you don't. Do you think there ought to be a separation there?

Mr. SALINGER. I choose to stand by the language the President used in his press conference.

Question. Pierre, is it a correct interpretation for us to say that a high White House official disclosed today that he called the National Broadcasting Co., and corrected something John Chancellor said? The same high White House official said—

Mr. SALINGER. I am not going to tell you—

Question. I know you will not tell us how to write it. But under the ground rules, that is what you are saying.

Mr. SALINGER. Under the ground rules, I would say you would say that a high White House official said that Pierre Salinger, the press secretary of the President, called.

Question. Pierre, how do you define "troops" and what is the difference between "troops" in your definition—

Mr. SALINGER. I will not get into that definition with you, Bob.

Question. Isn't that the problem we are trying to straighten out here?

Mr. SALINGER. I am going to stand by the language the President used. The situation on the broadcast this morning—if I could give you a comparison, would be of a Senator being interviewed on a television show and the Senator said, "Today is Tuesday," and the fellow interviewing him said, "Senator, that is an extraordinary statement." That is what happened this morning.

Question. Pierre, do you know whether the Russian soldiers are in Cuban uniforms in Cuba?

Mr. SALINGER. I have said everything I am going to say on the subject.

Question. Pierre, this is a procedural subject. Could we please clear up now, because it has been going on 18 months, why you cannot allow this to be attributed to the White House Press Secretary?

Mr. SALINGER. I have chosen to do it this way.

Question. Could you explain?

Question. You could put this off the record, if you like.

Question. Could you explain it?

Mr. SALINGER. No, I don't think I am called upon to explain it.

Question. If we go out from here and write a story saying that the White House official today said there was nothing new that hadn't been previously reported about KEATING's report that there were 5,000 troops in Cuba, this is not going to square with my understanding of what the President said. That is the point I am trying to belabor on this.

Mr. SALINGER. Senator KEATING chooses to use "troops" and we referred to them as "technicians," which is our information.

Question. You earlier used the words "military personnel."

Mr. SALINGER. That is right, and the President in his own press conference stated there were military personnel in Cuba and had been for some time.

Question. Would those be prisoners of war under the rules if they were captured, or civilians, or what?

Mr. SALINGER. No, he made a specific reference to a Soviet military mission.

Question. I think besides what KEATING said, Pierre, I keep trying to find out what is a "troop," what is a "soldier." Is a technician with a rifle a soldier?

Mr. SALINGER. The President stated explicitly what our understanding of the situation was last Wednesday. When and if we have any new information, you can be sure we will make it public, and it will not be for background. It will be on the record.

Question. Why does the White House take such an interest in one aspect of our foreign policy and refer to the State Department to take other aspects?

Mr. SALINGER. If you ever end up sitting in this chair, you can take that up.

Question. I am not going to end up sitting there, and you are sitting there now.

Mr. SALINGER. You are a lucky fellow, too.

Question. Pierre, does this administration have any plan for a total blockade of Cuba?

Mr. SALINGER. I am not going to discuss the subject any further.

Question. Pierre, did you call Chancellor while he was still on the air or after he signed off?

Mr. SALINGER. He was still on the air.

Question. What time was this?

Mr. SALINGER. It was about 8:05 this morning.

Question. Did he change his statement?

Mr. SALINGER. He changed his statement on the air afterward.

Question. Who did he say called him?

Mr. SALINGER. He didn't say who called him. He said, "An error has been called to my attention, and in a fast-moving broadcast like this, sometimes we make errors," and he corrected what the President said.

Question. Are you satisfied with his statement?

Mr. SALINGER. Totally satisfied.

Question. There has been reference to British ships carrying supplies to Cuba.

Mr. SALINGER. That question also came up at last Wednesday's broadcast.

Question. Pierre, I am handicapped, not having seen this broadcast.

Mr. SALINGER. You are not really handicapped.

Question. We are all cleared up on troops and technicians, I see; but what about this question of number? The President didn't use any number, regardless of what kind of persons they are.

Mr. SALINGER. Other Government agencies have used numbers.

Question. They say KEATING used two different numbers, 1,200 and 5,000. Which is the Government saying it is?

Mr. SALINGER. Again, I am not going further. I stand on what I said.

Question. You are agreeing with KEATING? Mr. SALINGER. If you read the transcript of what he said, you can see the context in which he used the figures.

Question. Did the President see the broadcast?

Mr. SALINGER. He did not see the broadcast, nor did I talk to the President before I talked to Mr. Chancellor.

Question. Are there any Chinese troops in Cuba? I am not kidding. Naval officers at Guantanamo said there are.

Mr. SALINGER. I have said everything I am going to say on the situation.

Question. Can you say anything about the situation in West Berlin, the movement of armored cars?

Mr. SALINGER. No.

Question. Pierre, another happy field, what is your attitude toward the Bolivian President canceling his trip to the United States because of the sale of tin out of our stockpile?

Mr. SALINGER. That is a subject which we are studying at the present time, and I would think we would have something to say about that later.

Question. You would think?

Mr. SALINGER. Yes.

Question. Like today?

Mr. SALINGER. It is possible.

Question. Pierre, to clarify the semantic problem on the "troops" or "military technicians," could the military mission in Cuba be compared with our military advisers in South Vietnam?

Mr. SALINGER. I will let you draw that comparison yourself.

Question. In another field, is the President contemplating a nonpolitical or political trip to New Hampshire?

Mr. SALINGER. There is no scheduled trip to New Hampshire at the present time. There are two Senate seats up in New Hampshire and I would not be surprised to see the President go to New Hampshire before the campaign is out.

Question. Would that be sometime near to the 18th when he votes in Massachusetts?

Mr. SALINGER. I couldn't tell you that now.

Question. Pierre, for technical reasons, can we expect the State Department statement on the U-2 before lunch?

Mr. SALINGER. That is possible.

Question. What was the question?

Mr. SALINGER. The question was whether you might expect the U-2 statement from the State Department before lunch. It depends how late you eat lunch, really.

Question. Have you any more jollies?

Question. No, I am clear.

Mr. ENGLE. In other words, Mr. President, on six different occasions,

authoritative spokesmen for the administration have laid before the American people the full facts as we have them with reference to the military buildup in Cuba. The President stated—and I repeat his statement—that whenever he has firm information he will make it available to the American people. I think he has done so, and the record completely refutes the first statement of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] that the administration should tell the American people the whole truth. The administration has told the American people the whole truth.

I assert that the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] was wrong. He implied that the President of the United

States and the administration were not giving the American people the whole truth. The fact is that in five separate instances prior to his statement of September 4, the President or administration spokesmen laid the facts on the table.

First, on August 22 at the press conference, in which the President answered specific questions on Cuba.

Second, on August 24, when the press and radio received a complete background briefing—out of which are supplied news stories appearing in the major metropolitan press.

Third, on August 29, when all of the House Members were invited to a briefing on the Cuban situation; and I may add that many attended.

Fourth, when a letter went to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate briefing the members on the Cuban situation; and

Fifth, on August 30, in the press conference held by the President, in which he again answered specific questions on the Cuban situation.

In short, in five different instances prior to Senator KEATING's allegation, the President or administration officials had spoken forth on this subject.

So Senator KEATING was wrong. He was wrong also in his statement that 5,000 men in Soviet uniforms were unloaded less than 100 miles off the shores of continental United States. There is no verification of this statement. As the President clearly indicated in his statement yesterday, September 4, there is no verification that Soviet troops are on Cuban soil. I agree that we can argue about what we mean by troops, and whether or not technicians are troops. I assert that technicians are not troops in the general sense understood by the American people—that is, attack forces.

Senator KEATING was wrong in saying, as he did in his speech on the Senate floor on August 31, that "amphibious vehicles were observed." According to our intelligence, there is no verification of that fact.

Senator KEATING was wrong in his implication that the island of Cuba has been turned into an offensive base against the United States and Latin America when he said it was "turned into an armed camp, a smoking grenade in the heart of the Western Hemisphere." The facts are that we have no evidence at all that offensive armaments—and by that I mean armaments for use in offensive combat—are being landed in Cuba.

The only evidence we have is that anti-aircraft defensive missiles with slant range of 25 miles have been put in place, together with the attendant radar and electronic equipment; and that certain patrol boats carrying ship-to-ship guided missiles having a range of 15 miles have been put in Cuba. At the present time the armaments being supplied to Cuba appear to be of the defensive type. Nothing in Cuba at the present time could be regarded as a major offensive threat against the United States.

Senator KEATING asserted that the Monroe Doctrine has been violated. The Monroe Doctrine has not been violated. The Monroe Doctrine applies to a situation in which a foreign power by force

overthrows an established regime in this hemisphere. The Soviets are in Cuba by invitation of the Castro government—which came into power before the present administration took office. The Monroe Doctrine, neither in its historical nor its literal sense, applies to a situation in which a government in power invites the assistance of a foreign power and receives such assistance. I should like to place in the Record an article, written by the distinguished columnist, Arthur Krock, which was published in the New York Times of September 4. The article deals with the problems of the Monroe Doctrine in the missile age. I offer the article for printing in the Record, and also an article entitled "Soviet-Cuban Treaty." The latter deals with the same subject matter, and was published on the same day in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 1962]
EFFECT OF THE MISSILE AGE ON HISTORIC DOCTRINES

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 3.—It now develops that the United States for some time has maintained a Navy patrol in the high seas off the Cuban ports, its purpose being to try to discover the complete nature of the cargoes and personnel which Soviet Russia has been landing on the island. At President Kennedy's news conference last week the questions addressed to him were limited to his views toward military intervention in Cuba and invasion by the United States. No one asked him about the ever-tightening naval patrol, so that its presence was first established in a Washington dispatch to this newspaper over the weekend.

This is obviously a very cautious operation, despite the fact that there is some fluttering about it in the dovescotes in the Department of State, or it is ineffective for its purpose. That is to acquire sound information on which the President can make a definite determination whether the Soviet supplies to Cuba threaten the security of the United States. For, though the foreign press and leaders of the anti-Castro Cubans in this country report that some of the Soviet "technicians" sent to the island strongly resemble active military personnel, and that some Russian matériel being landed has as much a potential for offensive as for defensive military activity, Mr. Kennedy has announced no official confirmation of either.

If or when this confirmation comes, however, only the consideration of national security will supply the President with a solid foundation for whatever his course of action may be. He repeated last week that the Monroe Doctrine means, and always has, that "we would oppose a foreign power extending its power to the Western Hemisphere." And he automatically found the Soviet Union guilty on this charge by adding that this "is why we are opposing . . . what is happening in Cuba today."

But the contrast between the manner in which this opposition is now being expressed, and its historic implementation sharply reveals how the cold war and the transoceanic atomic missile have changed diplomacy and the enforcement of treaties and doctrines. Presidents Polk and Cleveland, for example, were only two of the White House incumbents who warned off projected foreign power expansions in this hemisphere far less menacing than that Mr. Kennedy has certified to be proceeding in Cuba. His opposition, on the same cited basis of the Monroe Doctrine, has been limited to a

cautious naval patrol with inconclusive findings, cutting off our trade with Cuba, and, with small success, asking other members of the Organization of American States and certain NATO allies to do the same.

THE U.S. POWER EXPANSIONS

But though politicians think it necessary to continue to swear unswerving fealty to the Monroe Doctrine, few are unaware that changing times have compelled a new and modified application of it in international practice. To wage the free world struggle against the spread of aggressive international (Russian) communism, the United States has a ring of bases around the Soviet Union, Armed Forces in Europe and Asia and espionage agents wherever their placement helps to assure the security of the Nation. Moreover, Washington some years ago made the Monroe Doctrine a whole-sale hemispheric, and hence clearly a much less enforceable, commitment. So that, while President Kennedy expressed the meaning of the doctrine as Monroe, Polk, and Cleveland did, he cannot invoke it with the diplomatic consistency and immunity from disaster they enjoyed.

His one and only test for compulsive action toward Cuba is whether the United States will be endangered otherwise. And two particular cold war developments have made this test even more difficult to resolve. One is that the United States has not only allowed, but initiated, postwar worldwide commitments that tie down its freedom of action as the sleeping Gulliver's was by the people of Lilliput. The second (which is now being demonstrated in Cuba) is that aggression by infiltration, the aggression hardest to prove as justification for military retaliation, is a skill and science in which Moscow excels.

But how refreshing it would be if the President and the Department of State would turn away from slogans and openly concede the new facts of history and diplomacy.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 4, 1962]

SOVIET-CUBAN TREATY

The Soviet-Cuban treaty may only proclaim transactions already under way for the economic and military supply of Cuba, but it makes it very clear that the relationship that is developing is precisely the sort of connection with a European power which the Monroe Doctrine was intended to prevent.

What was feared in 1823 when the Holy Alliance was threatening the Latin American revolutions was the establishment in this hemisphere of a "political system" that was "essentially different" from that of America. And that is what the democratic countries of the hemisphere have to fear now.

President Monroe's message made quite clear the sort of intervention to which we objected. He said that we would regard as a manifestation of "an unfriendly disposition toward the United States, any interposition for the purpose of oppressing" the South American countries, or for "controlling in any other manner their destiny."

On the foreign acts we found hateful, the Monroe Doctrine was clear and unambiguous. It was not as clear in stating what we would have done if our wishes had been disregarded by the Holy Alliance. There is nothing ambiguous about our feelings today, either, but what ought to be done about the Cuban crisis is not as plain.

The Monroe Doctrine was directed toward an impending threat and an imminent hazard. The threat and the hazard did not immediately materialize. There have been occasions when the doctrine was flagrantly disregarded, however. And this country has not always been ready to fly instantly to arms. From 1823 to 1897, Great Britain, Spain, and France intervened in Mexico's affairs and on the withdrawal of Great Britain and Spain, France put Emperor Maximilian

on the throne and Austria supported him with arms. Secretary of State Seward wrote reproachful notes. The House adopted a resolution stating:

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States are unwilling, by silence, to leave the nations of the world under the impression that they are indifferent spectators of the deplorable events now transpiring in the Republic of Mexico; and they therefore think fit to declare that it does not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge a monarchical government, erected on the ruins of any republican government in America, under the auspices of any European power."

Secretary of State Seward warned in 1862 that "no monarchical government which could be founded in Mexico, in the presence of foreign navies and armies in the waters and upon the soil of Mexico, would have any prospect of security or permanency." Events vindicated his judgment in 1867 when Maximilian was killed and his regime overthrown.

It may be said with equal confidence that no Communist regime, "in the presence of foreign navies and armies" in the waters about it and on the soil of the country, has any good prospect of "security and permanency." We are indebted to the Soviet Union and to the Government of Cuba for an agreement that ought to make the foreign nature of this Government clear to the whole Western Hemisphere and to the world.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, what is our position? I think the President made it very clear in his statement of yesterday. He alluded to the defensive nature of the arms and equipment presently being unloaded in Cuba. Apparently, it is the purpose of the Soviets to bolster the fears of the Cuban people aroused by Castro that they may be invaded. The fears have been added to by some of the emotional statements made with reference to this subject, particularly those that call for an immediate invasion of Cuba. The action of the Soviets clearly gives support to the Cuban regime which plays upon the fears of the Cuban people. It is not helpful to us to have those fears substantiated by emotional statements from Members of this most deliberative body in the world.

As long as the equipment landed in Cuba is defensive in nature, it poses no threat to the United States or to our Latin American neighbors. Even offensive equipment of certain types would not pose a major threat to the United States. Can anyone imagine Cuba's initiating an invasion of the United States?

On the other hand, if ground-to-ground missiles are put in place in Cuba, they could deliver a nuclear warhead against targets in the United States. I think it is clear that in that event we must take action immediately. I believe that the Cuban Government, and the Soviets, too, ought to be put on notice that if ground-to-ground missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads are put in place in Cuba, we intend to move to take them out. Otherwise, our policy will be to interdict to stop the export of arms, propaganda, and the Communist philosophy from Cuba into the Western Hemisphere. We should pursue every reasonable method which will make that possible.

Finally, I emphasize that we must see the situation in Cuba in the perspective of the global obligations of the United

States of America. We are faced with problems in Berlin, in Europe; in Vietnam, in Laos, in the Far East, in the Mideast, and in Africa. Cuba is a carbuncle in the Caribbean—and not, at the moment at least, a cancer. We should treat the Cuban situation like a carbuncle—isolate it and prevent its spread. But we should not be led into unreasonable emotional or extreme actions that can only disrupt our international relationships. In short, I am confident that the President of the United States will continue to respond on the basis of an objective analysis of the facts to the situation we face in Cuba.

I am glad that we have a President of the United States young in years but old in judgment who calmly responds and coolly responds to one crisis after another, as he will to the one in Cuba.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate very long at this hour. I shall speak at greater length tomorrow in answer to the distinguished Senator from California and with reference to further matters on the situation in Cuba.

First, I welcome and I commend the President of the United States for speaking out on this subject. I want to make it very clear—let there be no doubt about it—that I have never said that the President, or, indeed, the administration, has made an untruthful statement about Cuba. I have said that the whole story has not been told the American people. That is still the case, Mr. President, even after the latest White House announcement yesterday.

If the Senator from California contends that the administration has made available to the people the facts contained in my remarks on the Senate floor last Friday and yesterday, all I can say to him is, Where was our most efficient press corps, the greatest press corps in the country, and perhaps in the world?

The fact is that all the administration announced, until yesterday, was general information similar to a very recent letter I received from the State Department. I apologize for the embarrassment which I am sure I am about to cause the Senator from California. On the 14th day of August, in an effort to get some official information, I wrote to the Department of State to ask them about Cuba and the buildup there, if there was one. Sixteen days later, on August 30, the Department wrote a letter to me, which arrived at my office just today. I quote one paragraph of this letter dated August 30, the very day the President made some important comments on Cuba at a press conference. This letter—an incredible letter in the light of what has happened since August 30, and indeed what had happened before that—reads in part as follows:

Several Soviet passenger and cargo ships arrived in Cuba during late July and early August.

I interpolate to say that "several" is a board word. The Department said nothing about the number, the large number involved.

carrying large quantities of supplies and substantial numbers of technicians of various kinds.

The Department has established that personnel landed from approximately five of the ships. We have no specific information about the number of persons.

I repeat, Mr. President, "We have no specific information about the number of persons."

We have no information that any Soviet-bloc troops have landed in Cuba. Although the full significance of these developments is not yet clear, there is no evidence that supplies and technicians have arrived in Cuba in such numbers as to provide support for external aggression from Cuba against other countries.

The Senator from California also maintains that these weapons in Cuba are defensive.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry? Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. KEATING. I will yield for a parliamentary inquiry, if the Senator wishes to make it.

Mr. ENGLE. I wanted to find out who had the floor, because I wanted to know who was yielding to whom.

Mr. KEATING. I have the floor at the moment, I believe.

Mr. ENGLE. That is very fine. I am glad to have the Senator have the floor.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure many unhappy Cuban people do not regard these as defensive weapons. I am sure Cuba's Caribbean neighbors do not regard them as defensive weapons.

A gun—and there are plenty of guns there—a tank, a Mig airplane, can be offensive as well as defensive. It is a question of who holds the gun. It is defensive or offensive according to the intentions of the man who triggers it.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I would like to complete my statement, as the Senator did.

Mr. ENGLE. Very well; go ahead.

Mr. KEATING. I did not interrupt the Senator from California. I would prefer to complete my statement, if I can, but I am willing to yield for a question.

Mr. ENGLE. Very well. Proceed.

Mr. KEATING. Who is to say whether a weapon is offensive or defensive? It depends entirely on the direction in which it is aimed.

Ground-to-air missiles, it is said, are defensive weapons. They can be. But is it defensive to fire on an American plane over international waters, as was done last week?

The Monroe Doctrine, I contend, has been violated. I will speak at greater length on this question tomorrow. I intend to quote from the Monroe Doctrine and I will also discuss some of the historical background of this important policy pronouncement.

Mr. President, the Monroe Doctrine has been violated. What is more, it has been drastically reinterpreted in recent months. It now applies to all Latin American countries except one—Cuba. It is a Monroe Doctrine minus one. Ap-

parently, we do not now object to the fact that Cuba is a base for foreign imperialism. We will only object if this Communist imperialism is extended to other nations by Cuba. Presumably, also under the interpretation of the Senator from California, we would not object elsewhere if local Communists took over by a coup d'etat, and then invited Mr. Khrushchev's troops in. In fact, it is beginning to look as if the only nation that the Monroe Doctrine does not clearly apply to is the United States.

As I have said, I shall have some further comments tomorrow. I appreciate this opportunity to reply briefly tonight to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, let me summarize very briefly what I said. I said that what is being moved into Cuba today is in the nature of defensive or passive systems. They have an antiaircraft missile which is as obsolete as our old Nike. It will shoot 25 miles. Some patrol boats are going in there. They have radar and electronic equipment going with them.

My complaint about the statement made by my friend from New York is that he said the President was not telling the American people the truth, or all the truth; and what I said was that on August 22 the President in his press conference made a statement on this subject matter.

On August 24 the press and radio personnel were given a background briefing. I have a copy of the transcript. The press releases are before every Senator.

On August 29 there was a briefing for all House Members who wanted to attend.

On August 30 the same information was sent to the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate.

On the same date, August 30, the President of the United States himself again answered questions with reference to the Cuban situation.

In other words, in five instances the President of the United States gave the people of America the best information he had. There may have been other information, but to say that it was firm or solid is another matter, because "intelligence" is what intelligence is. Sometimes intelligence is good and sometimes it is not. It must be verified.

The President spoke today about the installations in Cuba. The first information he had on that subject was last Friday. This information has to be evaluated. It has to be taken "over the coals" to see whether it makes any sense.

The President of the United States has clearly kept his word, which he gave in his press conference, which I read, in which he said that as fast as information became available he would give it to the American people.

Secondly—and I emphasize this—our posture is that when the Cubans are dealing in the area purely of defensive armaments we are not so much concerned. If they ever should get into a posture in which they have offensive armaments, either to invade other Latin American countries, or have ground-to-ground missiles—and this is important—

which could deliver a nuclear warhead from the cities of the United States must take action; and I will so urge the Senate floor. Those are the two points. That is the position we take. That is the position I wish to reaffirm as close as I can.

THE WESTERN STATES DEMOCRATIC CONFERENCE

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, several weeks ago I accepted an invitation extended to me by the Western States Democratic Conference to make a speech at their opening banquet in Seattle, Wash., the night of August 5.

The Western States Democratic Conference is a conference of Democratic leaders of the 13 Western States, including Hawaii and Alaska. The conference this year was dedicated to a discussion of the great problems which involve the welfare of the people. It sought to call the attention of the Democratic Party and the American people to the fact that, when all is said and done, in a democracy the thing which counts most happens to be the welfare of the people. It was a conference which, on the basis of the program and the agenda announced in advance, sought to challenge the Democratic Party to keep faith with Jeffersonian democracy and to put the rights and interests of the people always first.

It was a great honor to accept that invitation. The chairman of the Western States Democratic Conference this year was the national committeeman from my State, a great Democrat, a fine lawyer, a leader in my State for years, a former Assistant Secretary of the Interior, C. Girard Davidson.

I responded to the invitation by preparing a manuscript for a speech which I proposed to deliver at the conference.

I arrived at Seattle in the early evening of August 5, having previously released my speech to the press. When I arrived at the banquet the chairman of the conference and the other members on the program committee discussed with me the subject matter of my speech.

It will be recalled by the present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. Long of Hawaii in the chair], that August 5 was in the midst of the period when the Senate was engaged in the debate on the satellite communications bill, a bill with respect to which the Democratic Party made a sorry record and took an action in collusion with the Republicans in the Senate which, in my judgment, will rise to plague the Democratic Party for years to come, and so long as it permits the communications satellite law to remain on the books without drastic revision and amendment.

I knew the party-splitting nature of that subject matter. The manuscript which I prepared for the Western States Democratic Conference did not have a word about the satellite communications bill in it. But the manuscript, which I shall have printed in the Record shortly, devoted itself to the accomplishments of the Kennedy administration and pointed out the record which we were making in the Congress. I am proud to stand on that record. I was pleased to pre-

sent that record to the Western States Democratic Conference.

When the chairman of the conference, Mr. Davidson, and his associates on the program committee of the Western States Democratic Conference learned of the subject matter of my speech and read my speech, they goodnaturedly said, "That is not the speech we want you to give. There is only one thing we want to hear from you, because all afternoon in one of our general committees there has been a prolonged discussion and considerable controversy over the position of the Kennedy administration on the satellite communications bill, and that is the subject matter we want discussed. We think you should know that the point of view which you and your associates in the Senate in opposition to the bill have been presenting to the American people in recent days is clearly the point of view of the majority expression which we heard all afternoon in our discussion of the subject matter in this conference."

I pointed out to the chairman of the conference and to his associates that the other side was not represented, that I thought, if we were going to have a discussion of the satellite communications bill, someone should be there to represent the administration's point of view. I pointed out that, although I did not share the point of view of the administration and thought the administration was making a horrendous mistake, a mistake which could not be reconciled with the thesis of the Western States Democratic Conference—namely, the thesis of putting the interests of the people first, rather than brash materialism as to passing a bill which, for the first time in all of America's history, would legalize a cartel, nevertheless I did not share the view that my speech ought to be on that subject matter.

I was a guest of the conference. I was urged to accede to their wishes for a discussion of the satellite. A decision was reached whereby I presented my speech as written, and briefly summarized my position and the position of my associates in opposition to the satellite bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the manuscript of the speech which I had prepared and delivered at the banquet to which I referred on August 5, 1962, at the Western States Democratic Conference be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks tonight.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, the chairman of the banquet was one of our great Democrats of the West. He is one of the great Democratic Governors of the Nation—Governor Rosellini of the State of Washington. In attendance at the banquet was the national chairman of the Democratic Party, Mr. John Bailey.

In the course of my speech on the satellite bill I pointed out that the Democratic Party had a major responsibility of keeping the contract that it had entered into with the American people at Los Angeles, in 1960, when the Democratic Party presented its platform to the American people.

I apparently hold to the old-fashioned view that a political platform is a contract that a political party offers the voters, and that the consideration involved in that contract, as we lawyers say, happens to be the commitment for deliverance on the planks of the party platform in exchange for the votes of the people who have faith in the platform and confidence in the good faith of the party which offers the contract to the American voters.

In my Seattle speech I pointed out that the Democratic Party still had a long way to go to carry out its pledges and promises made in 1960. I pointed out that there was no plank in the Democratic platform of 1960 which promised the American people that the party would set up the most powerful monopoly in the history of our country and turn over to that monopoly billions of dollars of American taxpayers' investment in the space satellite system that we have developed at great cost to the American taxpayers and to the profit of the first cartel in our country.

We have set up a monopolistic combine that throws out free enterprise, for there is no free enterprise in the cartel system under the space satellite law that the Senate unfortunately passed and that the President unfortunately signed. Under that law those corporations in America that are not among the select few named in the cartel are on the outside looking in. They must come to that cartel with hat in hand and make whatever deal, if any, they can make with the cartel to participate in the development of a space satellite communications system.

Not only am I shocked by it, and not only was that little band of willful men and one woman shocked by it during the historic debate, but with every passing day increasingly thousands of American citizens are shocked by it as they begin to understand the tremendous giveaway of the Kennedy administration under a Democratic banner of the satellite systems in collusion with Republicans on the other side of the aisle.

When it was discovered that every Republican was for the bill, that ought to have been enough warning to the Kennedy administration to stop, look, and listen in regard to the dangers of the bill. But the bill passed, and it is legislative history. Those of us who stood on the floor of the Senate as liberals have stood up before against a galloping wrong majority in the Senate. But we are proud of the record we made and we are perfectly willing to let history—yes, and the American voters—be our judges.

Mr. President, in the course of my speech at the Seattle banquet I set out the major reasons and arguments of those of us opposed to the bill. The national chairman of the Democratic Party was present. There is no question about the fact that I discovered after the banquet that the point of view that I had expressed was the point of view that had been shared and expressed by many of the delegates at the conference in a controversial debate that afternoon preceding my speech. At the time I was not aware of the arguments